

Title	How Buckley Shot the Russian General : Historical Surface and Personal Depth in the Layers of the Realities in Finnegans Wake
Author(s)	Miyahara, Shun
Citation	待兼山論叢. 文学篇. 51 p.83-p.100
Issue Date	2017-12-25
oaire:version	VoR
URL	https://hdl.handle.net/11094/71399
rights	
Note	

Osaka University Knowledge Archive : OUKA

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

Osaka University

How Buckley Shot the Russian General:

Historical Surface and Personal Depth in the Layers of the Realities
in *Finnegans Wake*

Shun MIYAHARA

Keywords: *Finnegans Wake* / scatology / reality representation / Buckley and the Russian General

Introduction

James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* (hereafter cited as the *Wake*) is notoriously unintelligible due to its convoluted, multilingual, and punning wordplay. Despite the novel's difficulty, scholars have analysed the *Wake* to illuminate the main story line and proposed some of its principle motifs, such as Edenic sin, sexual offences, the fall of man, sibling rivalry, and the cyclic structure of human history. However, most critics have averted their attention from its prevalent scatological elements.

Despite the *Wake*'s many scatological elements, research in this sphere appeared only as recently as in the 1990s, when Vincent J. Cheng and Susan Brienza first propounded the significance of Wakean scatology. Following in their footsteps, Catherine Whitley discussed excrement in the context of national identity by juxtaposing the *Wake* with Djuna Barnes's *Nightwood*. Manabu Asai, likewise, centres his study on the historical relationship between the dung heap and the Boston Tea Party. Andrew Mitchell, like Cheng and Brienza, claims the consubstantiality of characters' defecation with the act of creation by analysing the episodes of Shem the Penman and Buckley's shooting of the Russian general. More recently, Kelly Anspaugh utilises the abject, Julia Kristeva's crucial concept, to present a new perspective on the *Wake*'s excrementality. All these critics focus on excremental motifs in the text, but they stick to a main story structure established by previous researchers, such as Joseph Campbell and Henry Morton Robinson. This narrow focus results in a one-sided and crystal-clear interpretation that largely ignores the tangled semiotic relationships between wordplay and meaning. Rather than determining the monolithic meaning of each scatological motif, the complicated relationships between different semiotic structures needs to be unravelled.

In this essay, I will chiefly examine the episode of “How Buckley Shot the Russian General” which provides insight into the novel’s scatological qualities. The title chiefly appears, however, as “How Burghley shuck the rackushant Germanon” (338.2-3) and “How Buccleuch shocked the rosing gimirilles” (346.19-20) in its unique transformations. The episode, presented within the framework of the television skit by comedians Butt and Taff, includes two fictional characters, Buckley and the Russian general. According to the consensus of previous studies, the episode narrates the story of Buckley, an Irish soldier, shooting the Russian general during the Crimean War. The episode, reflecting its setting, is narrated in a multilingual locution made up of Russian, Ruthenian, Polish, Bulgarian, Armenian, Albanian, and Greek. (Miyata 386-400). In the first stage of the episode, Buckley hesitates to shoot the Russian general because he finds the general defecating. In the following scene, the latter wipes himself, which makes the shooter determined to kill the general. The story line seems simple; however, several explanations as to why Buckley hesitates and then finally shoots have remained unreconciled.

José Ortega y Gasset’s view of reality can be used to analyse the semiotic structure of this enigmatic episode. He argues that “[t]here are two overlapping realities. One is substantial and essential in the underlying layer, and the other signifies the visual and accidental reality in the upper counterpart” (my trans; 197). The two realities constitute strata: the easy visibility of the upper layer conceals the lower. If historical reality in the surface conceals the underlying personal reality, the historicity of the episode camouflages its personal aspects. Crimean War and modern society denotes the surface historical reality, while the personal relationships between the characters connote personal reality. The episode presents the upper stratum of reality in a form which is syntactically transparent and grammatically coherent. However, the underlying reality is fragmented and suggestive because the information is scattered over the episode, bracketed or obscured by wordplays. Using a word-by-word examination of the *Wake’s* language, this essay reveals the episode’s structure by peeling apart the historical and personal layers. Through this process, the essay will propose reasons why Buckley first hesitates and then shoots the Russian general.

1. Crimean War

For when meseemim, and tolfoklokken rolland allover ourloud's lande, beheaving up that sob of tunf for to claimhis, for to wollpimsolff, puddywhuck. Ay, and untuoning his culothone in an exitous erseroyal *Deo Jupto*. At that instullt to Igorladns! Prronto! I gave one dobblenotch and I ups with my crozzier. Mirrdo! With my how on armer and hits leg an arrow cockshock rockrogn. Sparro! (*FW* 353.15-21)

This chapter will examine the political/religious aspect of the surface historical reality. Critics have discussed this episode in light of Irish nationalism and military codes, but they have dismissed the idiosyncratic features of the Crimean War. The episode denotes these features like chivalry and the hypocritical attitude of a crusade. Nationalism and religious feelings conspire to justify war, which leads to a revelation of the self-deceptive aspects of nationalism. Furthermore, the fictionality of the episode confirms that the historical reality conceals the underlying personal reality.

Joyce's biographer Richard Ellman provides the most influential clue to interpret this episode:

Buckley, [Joyce] explained, was an Irish soldier in the Crimean War who drew a bead on a Russian general, but when he observed his splendid epaulettes and decorations, he could not bring himself to shoot. After a moment, alive to his duty, he raised his rifle again, but just then the general let down his pants to defecate. The sight of his enemy in so helpless and human a plight was too much for Buckley, who again lowered his gun. But when the general prepared to finish the operation with a piece of grassy turf, Buckley lost all respect for him and fired. (411)

This passage presents four analytical points. First, Buckley hesitates to shoot the Russian general because he is awed by the enemy's high decoration. Second, motivated by his military duty, he raises his weapon to eliminate the enemy. Third, he observes the general starting to defecate and refrains from shooting because of his enemy's vulnerable state. Finally, the Russian general wipes himself with a piece of

turf, which wipes away Buckley's respect for the enemy figure. The author's explanation of the episode seems plausible, but however convincing it seems, it should not be believed unconditionally. This explanation misled critics to some false assumptions, for instance that the Russian general's high rank prevents Buckley from shooting him.

Before beginning the discussion, the episode's connection to the Crimean War should be confirmed. What has transpired from this murky episode definitely signals it. Take some peculiar words from the text: "Chromean fastion" (339.9-10), which could be Crimean fashion; "Crimealian" (347.10), phonologically similar to Crimean; and "Sea vaast a pool" (338.14), a pun on Sevastopol in Crimea. Furthermore, the Russian general, referred to as "slavey generals" (351.22) or "urssian gemenal" (352.1), hints at historical Russian generals who served in the nineteenth century during the Crimean War operations, such as Nikolay Bobrikov ("bobbycop"; 338.32), Korniloff ("Tanah Kornalls"; 351.22), and Eduard Totleben ("Toadlebens"; 339.21). Historically, in 1853 Russian emperor Nikolai I declared war against the Ottoman Empire, a war that involved Britain, France, and Piedmont-Sardinia in Italy in addition to the two empires. The war ended with the defeat of Russia and the signing of the Treaty of Paris in 1856 (Miyata 386; Figes xix-xx). Although this war has curious affinities with the world wars, it also has some characteristic features of great import to this episode: chivalry and an affected crusade.

To examine the historical reality of the episode, it is necessary to summon up the historical figures that Buckley represents. Buckley is a polyvalent character with three historical personae: William Montagu Douglas Scott, 6th Duke of Buccleuch; Cecil Buckley; and Lord Burghley. These figures will refute, characterise, and historicise the author's view as well as the other critical explanations about Buckley's initial hesitation and ultimate shooting. The 6th Duke of Buccleuch figure, occurring from "Buccleuch" in one of the title representations "How Buccleuch shocked the rosing gimirilles" (346.19-20), was "defeated by Gladstone in Midlothian in 1879" (McHugh 346). Significantly the figure is an aristocrat, which disproves Joyce's account of Buckley's hesitation. Ellmann states that "when he [Buckley] observed his [the Russian general's] splendid epaulettes and decorations, he could not bring himself to shoot" (411). According to the author's biography, the targeted general's high rank seems to provide the reason for the shooter to not kill him. In the historical

context, since Cecil Buckley served as a British lieutenant during the Crimean War (*Glosses*), he was a lower rank than the Russian general. Nevertheless, in the fictitious episode, the curious wordplay on his name transforms Buckley into the 6th Duke of Buccleuch. He is no longer subordinate to the Russian general but a duke who has no reason to stand in awe of the general's high rank.

William Sayers submits another reason for Buckley's hesitation when faced with the Russian general's defecation. He points out that "... Buckley's first reaction is not one of awe but rather a reluctance or inability to act in the face of incongruity, ... by unbuttoning his breeches and squatting down, the general has momentarily ceased to be a military man but has no substitute public persona. It is his transient non-combatant status that gives Buckley pause . . ." (Sayers 153-54). His opinion that the Russian general ceases to be a military figure by the act of defecation elaborates Joyce's other reason for Buckley's hesitation. The author claims that Buckley hesitates to shoot because of the enemy's unguarded state, which Sayers paraphrases as the state of a "non-combatant." Although Sayer's opinion provides a suggestive insight that his "non-combatant status" temporarily protects the Russian general from his impending doom, he bases his answer from the general assumption that two oppositional enemies must fight openly and squarely, an aspect of chivalry, which should be examined in more detail within the context of the Crimean War.

Cecil Buckley, another historical persona of Buckley, illuminates the importance of chivalry in this episode. He served as a "British naval lieutenant" (*Glosses*) and undertook "special services of a hazardous kind" to avert "the evil of having to risk many lives" in the Crimean War (Kinglake 74); Cecil Buckley therefore represents the heroic war figure. The importance of chivalry in the Crimean War distinguishes it from the following world wars: "it was the last war to be conducted by the old codes of chivalry, with 'parliamentaries' and truces in the fighting to clear the dead and wounded from the killing fields" (Figs xix). The code of chivalry on the battlefield forces both rival armies to cease fighting, which not only confirms but also historicises Sayers' claim that the Russian general's status as a "non-combatant" prevents Buckley from shooting him.

Joyce attributes Buckley's shot to his loss of veneration for the Russian general. However, this reasoning is groundless because the duke figure disproves that the reason for Buckley's hesitation is his respect for the general's high rank. Sayers implies that Buckley's Irish nationalism is the cause: "[b]ut a farther act, the wiping

away with grass, moves him to a more fraught arena when Buckley would have been stimulated to act, less as a British soldier than as an Irish patriot" (154). The language of Butt, who impersonates Buckley, confirms his seemingly arbitrary connection with Irish patriotism. First, before the encounter with the Russian general, Butt refers to his comrades. Because "the British army recruited heavily" in Ireland during the Crimean War (Figes xix; in fact Butt is also "unlist [enlisted]" (350.34)), there are three Irish and two British in the party ("praddies three and prettish too [paddies three and British two]" (351.7)), among which "Woodbine Willie" (351.12) and "Chorney Chaplain" (351.13) must be British. The former is "the Reverend Stoddart Kennedy, British chaplain who distributed Woodbine cigarettes to the troops in World War I" (*Glosses*), and the latter is Charlie Chaplin, an English movie actor. Despite the ambiguous nationality of "Homard Kayenne" (351.9-10), "Paddy Bonhamme" (351.16) signals Irish; thus, it is plausible that Butt is the other Irish man in their party. Next, Butt often shouts "Ullahbluh!" (339.2), an Irish phrase "I Uladh abú" meaning "Ulster to victory" (McHugh 339). Last, the most lucid indication for Butt's Irish patriotism lies in "oreland for a rolvever" (352.9), a mixture of Ireland for revolver (*Glosses*) and "[a] Roland for an Oliver" (McHugh 352). Moreover, Butt can be a historical figure in Ireland: Isaac Butt, who "is an Irish barrister and politician. He is reputed to have been a great orator and a kindly man; known as the 'father of Home Rule,' he was also famous for his participation in the defenses of Smith O'Brien in 1848 and of the Fenian Conspirators (1865-68)" (Gifford and Seidman 143). In short, Butt epitomises the Irish patriotic movement.

Buckley argues that he has killed the Russian general for his nation, Ireland: "[f]or when meseemim, and tolfoklokken rolland allover ourloud's lande, beheaving up that sob of tunf for to claimhis, for to wollpimsolff, puddywhuck. . . . *At that instultt to Igorladns!* Pronto! I gave one dobblenotch and I ups with my crozzier. Mirrdo! With my how on armer and hits leg an arrow cockshock rockrogn. Sparro!" (353.15-21; emphasis added). Buckley shoots the Russian general when he sees him wiping himself with the sod of turf after defecation. Ellmann notes a remarkable episode on this account: "[Joyce] then narrated the story of Buckley; when he came to the piece of turf, Beckett remarked, 'Another insult to Ireland.' This was the hint Joyce needed; it enabled him to nationalize the story fully . . ." (411). Thus, Irish patriotism informs his motives for the shot, to which the phrase "[a]t that instultt to Igorladns! [at that insult to Ireland!]" (353.18-19) might be cited as additional

evidence. Significantly, Kyouko Miyata points out the substitutability between Sevastopol in Crimea and Dublin in Ireland. Sevastopol means a cess pool while Dublin originally derives from “Dubh linn” signifying black pool, making the two different cities the same place (386). This makes the soil of Sevastopol become, at the same time, that of Ireland, and consequently, the Russian general’s wipe-over becomes an insult to Ireland.

The religious context in which Buckley shoots the Russian general can be explicated with Lord Burghley, Buckley’s other historical persona. Lord Burghley was sixteenth-century English statesman who suppressed Catholic recusants under Elizabeth I (*Glosses*). In contrast, “rackushant” in “How Burghley shuck the rackushant Germanon” (338.2-3) denotes that the Russian general is a recusant figure, which, historically defined, means “a person (as a Roman Catholic) refusing to attend the services of the Church of England” (“Recusant,” def. 1a). Furthermore, the Russian general is an Irish emancipator of Catholics as both “Tanah Kornalls” (351.22) and “Dom Allaf O’Khorwan” (352.33-34) signal Daniel O’Connell, who was the Irish Catholic emancipator. Thus Buckley, belonging to the Church of England, shoots the Russian general who is an Irish Catholic recusant.

This religious rivalry between the Catholic Church and the Church of England parallels the religious conflict in the Crimean War. As Orlando Figes states,

Historians have tended to dismiss the religious motives of the war. Few devote more than a paragraph or two to the dispute in the Holy Land – the rivalry between the Catholics or Latins (backed by France) and the Greeks (supported by Russia) over who should have control of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem and the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem –even though it was the starting point (and for the Tsar a sufficient cause) of the Crimean War. (xxiii)

The war was, according to Figes, “a *crusade* for the defence of liberty and European civilization against the barbaric and despotic menace of Russia” (xxii; emphasis added). In this historical context, Ireland and England, along with other countries, fought together against Russia. Butt’s locutions sanction their religious alliance. In his reminiscence of wartime, he uses phrases such as “we was” (351.6) or “we has” (351.7), in which the singular form of the verbs with the plural subject “we” implies a spiritual bond between Irish soldiers and English ones. The portmanteau “engrish”

(351.8) vindicates this reading as it unites English and Irish. Therefore, in the context of the Crimean War, the focus does not lie in the religious opposition between the Catholic Church and the Church of England but in “the rivalry between the Catholics or Latins (backed by France) and the Greeks (supported by Russia)” (Figs xxiii).

The religious rivalries in both the Catholic repression and in the Crimean War share the quality of a crusade. First, a crusade is a religious rivalry that justifies itself because the objective fact in the religious rivalry cannot endow the justification to either side of the religious opposition. Crusaders only justify themselves when they pretend to have God’s order. In the episode, Buckley hears a biblical voice “sham! hem! or chaffit!” (351.26-27) which suggests Noah’s three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japhet and thus encourages him to serve as a crusader as if he receives God’s will. Therefore, he shoots the Russian general along with “the splinters of colt [splendours of God]” (352.9), shouting “Almagnian Gothabobus! [Almighty God above us]” (352.11). Also, he raises his crosier, “crozzier” (353.20), against the Russian general as if he is carrying out the mandate of Heaven. Finally, he decides the general’s doom with a word: “rockrogn [Ragnarok]” (353.21), the fate of the gods. This affectation of crusade’s self-justification parallels the Irish nationalism in this episode. Therefore, the validity of Irish nationalism, which Buckley claims for his shooting of the Russian general, is put into question. This implies that neither the nationalism nor the crusade has an objective justification, but they both pretend to be justice.

Although the foundation of the episode lies in the historical fact of the Crimean War, its fictionality is revealed in the details. First, there is a historical discordance. Buckley calls himself a “prive [private]” (351.20), but the correspondent historical figure Cecil Buckley served as a lieutenant in the war (Kinglake 71, 74). Next, Butt butts in with “Senonnevero!” (353.9) and says that “[t]hat he leaves nyet is my grafe” (353.9-10). The former signifies the Italian phrase “se non è vero, è ben trovato,” in other words, “if it is not true, it is a happy invention.” The latter could be “that he lives yet/not is my grief/work” (as “nyet” can be yet, or the Russian “net” meaning “not,” and “grafe” consists of archaic “grafe,” corresponding to “work,” and grief in English; McHugh 353). What this implies is that Butt concedes to the possibility of the fictionality of his story. Finally, one should doubt the verisimilitude of the setting. Among Buckley’s comrades, “Paddy Bonhamme he vives” (351.16), and the episode happens in “fanagan’s week” (351.2). The former phrase can be read as “Paddy

Bonhamme revives,” corroborated by the latter which implies the resurrection motif underlying the *Wake*. The resurrection, of course, does not happen in the historical context.

It is difficult to interpret the fictionality of an episode which is mainly based on historical facts. The structure of the upper reality so far discussed should be maintained because it is based on the historicity of the episode. However, its fictional aspect cannot be dismissed. The fictionality reveals the status of the upper reality, which covers up the reality underneath. The fictionality threatens the absoluteness of the visible surface reality.

Overall, in the political/religious quality of the surface reality, those features of the Crimean War historicise the episode. First, chivalry explains the author's and Sayers' opinion about the reason for the Buckley's hesitation. Second, although Irish nationalism should be the reason for Buckley's shooting of the general, the crusade divulges the self-justification of nationalism as well as the religious conflict. On the other hand, despite the episode being based in history, its fictionality exposes the relativity of the surface reality's status, which implies the existence of depth.

2. Modern Civilisation and Excrement

This chapter discusses the episode's other upper reality, which is characterised as cultural because two values concerning excrement are in opposition. Buckley believes in the value of scatology, while the Russian general forsakes it for modern civilisation's opposite value system. In this discussion, Kristeva's concept of the abject will be utilised to denote excrement. The paralleled relationship between this excremental episode and the Shem the Penman episode plays an important role in the following analysis.

David S. Barnes asserts that “the rise of the modern state and the strength of the bourgeois family as building blocks of European civilization in the early modern period rested upon a rejection of excrement, bodily odors, and everything reminiscent of human beings' base, animal origins” (113). He argues that modern civilisation stands on the repudiation of excrement. The notion of the abject can effectively explain the relationship between modern civilisation and bodily fluids. Kristeva describes the abject as:

The object has only one quality of the object – that of being opposed to *I*. If the object, however, through its opposition, settles me within the fragile texture of a desire for meaning, which, as a matter of fact, makes me ceaselessly and infinitely homologous to it, what is *abject*, on the contrary, the jettisoned object, is radically excluded and draws me toward the place where meaning collapses. (1-2)

Firstly, the abject exists between the subject and the object. As with the object, the abject opposes the subject, and at the same time, it is the object jettisoned by the subject. Further, she defines the abject as belonging to the death sphere, beyond the border of life, and producing nausea, like excrement (1-3). However, the abject is profoundly associated with the subject's identity on the grounds that it never does become a target of the subject's desire. In other words, the subject finds no sense of value in the abject. Finally, William Cohen, referring to excrement in general, argues that to label someone or something as dirty fixes otherness to them, excluding them (ix-x). Similarly, Whitley points out that the establishment of identity is fundamentally a process of exclusion. The repudiation of excrement in modern civilisation clearly parallels the act of abjection, the act in which the subject jettisons an object such as bodily fluids as the abject. If, as Mary Douglas suggests, excremental aversion is a cultural construct, then "[e]ach culture must have its own notions of dirt and defilement which are contrasted with its notions of the positive structure which must not be negated" (160). Thus, the abjection of excrement in the episode must be considered connected with modern civilisation's value system.

This extensive episode clearly contrasts with the Shem the Penman episode, volume 1 chapter 7. Each character in these episodes defecates, but, following this, the Russian general wipes himself while Shem proceeds to his artistic project with his excrement. Buckley values the excrement that modern civilisation regards as the abject. First, because he corresponds to Shem, the voice calls out "'sham! hem! or chaffit!" (351.26-27), which implies that Buckley corresponds to Shem, and Butt is summoned "*by mailbag*" (350.11), a phrase which denotes Shaun the Post, Shem's twin brother who conflicts with him. Second, because Shem sets a high value on excrement in the process of his artistic creation; he defecates, makes ink from his own faeces, and paints on his own body.

Mitchell, together with Cheng and Brienza, interprets the whole process of

defecation and painting as the artistic process in their discussion of Shem's scatological creation (ch. 1; 95; 117). Thus Mitchell believes that Buckley hesitates to shoot the Russian general because the latter's defecation holds the former in awe of creation; when the general wipes himself, Buckley kills him because the creator forsakes the relation to his own creation (ch. 3). However Mitchell falsely endorses creation discourse as his principle when interpreting Shem's scatological art, as well as the episode of Buckley and the Russian general. The process of excretion must be distinguished from the subsequent artistic creation because, if the defecation *were* the act of creation, the following behaviour would become less meaningful. Rather, Shem's defecation must be considered as abjection, and the scatological painting on his body signifies the restoration of the abject (Miyahara). Therefore, abjection will be used to analyse the Russian general's defecation.

The Russian general jettisons the abject, his bodily refuse, and completely wipes it away. This act sets him in acute opposition to Butt's, Buckley's and Shem's scatological value. In the scene at issue, Buckley looks at the Russian general in the distance, "a few versets [versts] off" (343.35). Buckley reports: "[f]irst he s s steppes. Then he st stoo stoopt" (339.30), about which "a stooleazy" (343.27-28), a pun on a stool of ease, denotes the preparation for excretion. In a fascinating parallel with Shem, the observed evacuates his bowels: he "salubrate himself with an ultradungs" (343.28-29), which translates into that he lubricates himself with an ultra-dung, with urination and farting, "pompship" (343.29-30) signals pump shipping, and "brokeforth" (343.33) phonetically resembles "break fart" and recalls Leopold Bloom's defecation after breakfast in *Ulysses* (*Glosses*). Confronted with the act of defecation, not creation but abjection, which is not in agreement with Buckley's belief in scatological value, Buckley waits for the general's act after his defecation. Nonetheless, the Russian general wipes away the excrement, "wollpimsolff" (353.17), completing the act of abjection and denying the expectation of the observer. At this moment, Buckley's value system, which respects excrement, completely opposes the Russian general's value system, on which modern civilisation is based. Therefore, the final act of the Russian general leads Buckley to the decisive resolution: "[a]t that instullt [instant]" (353.18) Buckley shoots the general with three battle cries "Prronto!" (353.19), "Mirrdo!" (353.20), and "Sparro!" (353.21), the second of which represents Buckley's scatological faith by punning on the French "merde," that is, excrement. The irrecoverable abject provokes Buckley to shoot the

Russian general, who dies for his faith in modern civilisation's value system.

To summarise this chapter, the surface historical reality presents a modern civilisation, and its representative the Russian general, that repudiates excrement as the abject. However, Buckley cannot accept the enemy's value system; when the excrement is abjected, he shoots the Russian general.

3. The Personal Reality in the Depth

And, by Jova I never went wrong nor let him doom till, risky wark rasky wolk, at the head of the wake, up come stumblebum (ye olde cottomptable!), his urssian gemenal, in his scutt's rudes unreformed and he went before him in that nemcon enchelonce with the same old domstoole story and his upleave the fallener as is greatly to be petted (whitesides do his beard!) and I seen his brichashert offensive and his boortholomas vадnhammaggs vise a vise them scharlot runners and how they gave love to him and how he took the ward from us (odious the fly fly flurtation of his him and hers! Just mairmaid maddeling it was it he was!) and, my oreland for a rolvever, sord, by the splunthers of colt and bung goes the enemay the Percy rally got me, messsger, (as true as theirs an Almagnian Gothabobus!) to blow the grand off his aceupper. Thistake it's [sic] meest! And after meath the dulwich. We insurrectioned and, be the procuratress of the hory synnotts, before he could tell pullyirragun to parrylewis, I shuttm, missus, like a wide sleever! Hump to dump! Tumbleheaver! (*FW* 351.35-52.15)

In this chapter, I will argue that personal reality underlies the political/religious and cultural featured historical reality. Personal reality is difficult to detect because it is concealed under the surface reality; key information that reveals personal reality is fragmented, bracketed, and sometimes grammatically broken. However, this Wakean strategy represents stratified reality. In the episode, personal reality hides behind Butt's superficial, though seemingly honest, explanation of the situation. Buckley's personal motives for shooting underlie the surface historical reality. He pretends to claim Irish nationalism as his motive for killing the Russian general, but his diction reveals his driving emotion.

He says "I did not care three tanker's hoots, ('sham! hem! or chaffit!) for *any feelings from my lifeprivates*" (351.26-27; emphasis added). He seems to proclaim

that he draws a neat line between his military duty and private life, which, conversely makes the reader doubt his narration. His utterance supplies a further clue: "And, by Jova I never went wrong nor let him doom till . . . at the head of the wake" (351.35-36); he does not originally intend to kill the Russian general until the beginning of the week, and more significantly Buckley concedes that Buckley himself was to blame for the shooting. In fact, two passions drive Buckley to shoot the Russian general.

As to one of Buckley's passions, Sayers makes the point: "Buckley's shot is . . . his act of dominance over and penetration of the abject, half-naked man in his sights. . . . The shooting of the Russian general is then about two overlapping acts of pleasure, the general's intestinal relief and Buckley's covert gaze in the body and its function, which leads to *ejaculation from rifle and/or penis*" (154-55; emphasis added). His insight about the parallel between the ejaculations of Buckley's rifle and his penis has homosexual implications between the shooter and the shot. A phrase signifying the Russian general, "slavey generales" (351.22), which also implies genitals, consolidates the impression of sexual discourse. Oscar Wilde, "askormiles" (350.21), a figure who epitomises homosexuality, confirms the homosexuality in the episode. Butt is described as "*Mr Lhugewhite Cadderpollard with sunflowered beautionhole pulled up point blank by mailbag mundaynism at Oldbally Court*" (350.10-12), on which Roland McHugh annotates that "Lady Campbell said Oscar Wilde was like a *great white caterpillar*" and that "Wilde wore *flower in buttonhole* at his 1st trial" (350; emphasis added). Thus, Buckley's shot, which parallels the ejaculation of his penis, is driven by his homosexual desire towards the Russian general.

Furthermore, the motifs of incest and patricide add to Buckley's homosexuality, which appears in the relationship between the two characters. As stated above, Butt embodies Shem, one of the sons of the father figure HCE, who the Russian general represents as "*Emancipator, the Creman hunter (Major Hermyn C. Entwistle)*" (342.19-20; emphasis added), "*Erminia's capecloked hoodoodman*" (339.29-30; emphasis added), or "*His Cumbulent Embulence*" (352.32-33; emphasis added). Further consolidating their family relationship, they belong to the same organisation, *viz.*, the Rosierucians, which is indicated by Butt's statement that "we was the redugout rawrecruitmenters" (351.6-7), and a portmanteau "Russkakruscam" (352.33) signifies this group and the Russian general. The relationship between Buckley and the Russian general manifests both incestuous and patricidal desires. Overall,

Buckley's shooting of the Russian general has two overlapping meanings. Buckley is driven by his homosexual desire to shoot the Russian general with his penis, while the patricidal desire forces him to kill his own father figure.

However, the homosexual aspect of the episode by no means justifies Buckley's act of killing his father. In fact, there is another passion which urges him to patricide. But Buckley's failure to openly explicate the concrete situation – shooting the Russian general – obscures his personal reality. His words implicitly reveal it, but these words are scattered over the passages, often in brackets, and twisted by wordplay. His personal reality is that he is jealous of the general and envies him as a man. He grudges the general's flirtations with women: “. . . how they [women] gave love to him and how he took the ward from us (odious the fly fly flirtation of his him hers! Just mairmaid maddeling it was it he was!) and, my oreland for a rolvever, sord, by the splunthers of colt . . .” (352.6-9). Buckley resents the flirtation so much that he stammers and the syntax breaks away: “odious the fly fly flirtation of his him hers! Just mairmaid maddeling it was it he was!” (352.7-8). He adds Ireland (“oreland”) for his justification of the patricide, but his true motivation comes from jealousy. Thus, his homosexual desire towards the Russian general and his heterosexual desire towards women coexist as ambiguous emotions in his personal reality.

However, his heterosexual desire is not towards women but a particular woman. He says to a woman, “. . . before he [the Russian general] could tell pullyirragun [‘to elaborate things’ (Greek word ‘polyergon’)] to parrylewis (‘parry’ means to defend oneself), I shuttm [shot him], missus, like a wide sleever!” (352.14-15). He shows off his deed to a woman who might have previously flirted with the general. First, the woman Buckley loves appears as “Misses Celana Dalems” (351.29-30), her name featured as the phonetically similar Malay words “chelana dalam,” signalling drawers; thus, she takes on a sexual air. Next, “Prostatates, pujealousities!” (350.15) means “excuse me, please (‘prostitute pozhaluista’ in Russian)” on the surface, but these words signify prostitutes as well as pure jealousy. Taking account of the many words that insinuate prostitution, Misses Celana Dalems must be one of the prostitutes or a camp follower. For example, “respectables” (351.28) signals Oriental brothels (McHugh 351); “assissterhood” (351.29) a brothel staff; “fallener” (352.3) a fallen woman; and “bludger” (351.34), “touters” (351.34), “pimpadoors” (351.34) and “wide sleever [white slaver]” (352.15) pimps. Finally, the appearance of the

word “umbozzle [embezzle]” (352.30) insinuates that the Russian general robs Buckley of Misses Celana Dalems. Because he retrieves her, he happily describes the death of the Russian general: “the euphorious hagiohygiecynicism of his die” (353.8), that is, euphoric hagio-hygiene/cynicism of his death.

To sum up, Buckley shoots the Russian general because of their love affair with the prostitute, Misses Celana Dalems, while disguising himself as an Irish patriot. However, his homosexual desire towards the Russian general parallels his heterosexual desire. On the one hand, he achieves his heterosexual desire by killing the Russian general as the thief of his lover Celana Dalems. On the other hand, his homosexual desire comes to fruition by raping the Russian general, as his rifle’s shot connotes his penis’s ejaculation. Therefore, Buckley’s personal reality reveals a perverted sexual desire which drives him to shoot.

Conclusion

Overall, the Wakean scatological episode of “How Buckley Shot the Russian General” represents the ways in which reality is structured in layers. The historical reality of political/religious and cultural aspects exists in the visible upper layer. Although personal reality lies beneath it, historical reality must not be denied because these strata coexist. With its features of the Crimean War, the politico-religious reality presents the reason for Buckley’s hesitation and shot, while cultural reality reveals Buckley’s disobedience to the modern society’s value system, which rejects excrement as the abject. Peeling away the upper historical reality reveals Buckley’s personal reality, his ambivalent sexual desire: he shoots the Russian general to reclaim his lover Celana Dalems, but his homosexual desire drives him to ejaculate at the sight of the Russian general. In this way, historical reality conceals personal reality in the episode, which, I believe, must reflect how reality works outside fiction.

Furthermore, this layered reality might suggest that the episode represents dual excrementality in the Wakean representation of reality. Excrement cannot be ordered and categorised, and it becomes the abject when jettisoned from ordered reality. First, the Wakean wordplay is itself excremental: it is chaotic, undefinable, and therefore, abject. However, if surface reality is easily ordered by close analysis, then the upper layer’s excrement can be categorised into an ordered structure so that it is

no longer abject. On the other hand, the lower layer is made invisible. In other words, the upper structure of reality jettisons personal reality from the reality that can be ordered and categorised. In fact, because personal reality consists of Buckley's ambivalent sexuality and inconsistent desires, it cannot be clearly defined, categorised, and ordered. Personal reality is the abject stratum in reality's layered structure. Surface reality jettisons not-to-be-categorised elements as the abject from its ordered structure, creating a lower excremental stratum. This episode's scatological elements epitomise this.

[Works Cited]

- Anspaugh, Kelly. "Powers of Ordure: James Joyce and the Excremental Vision(s)." *Mosaic: A Journal for the Interdisciplinary Study of Literature*, vol. 27, no. 1, 1994, search.proquest.com.remote.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/printviewfile?accountid=16714.
- Asai, Manabu. "Koyashi no Yama kara Horiokosareru Tegami: *Finnegans Wake* ni okeru 'Hakkou' 'Cha' 'Genshi' no Mochifu no Renkan" ["Letter from Litter : On the Connections of 'Fermentation,' 'Tea' and 'Atom' in *Finnegans Wake*"]. *The Scientific Reports of Kyoto Prefectural University: Humanities and Social Science*, vol. 57, 2005, pp. 1-13.
- Barnes, David S. "Confronting Sensory Crisis in the Great Stinks of London and Paris." Cohen and Johnson, pp. 103-29.
- Brienza, Susan. "Kraping Out: Images of Flow and Elimination as Creation in Joyce and Beckett." *Re: Joyce 'n Beckett*, edited by Phyllis Carey and Ed Jewinski, Fordham UP, 1992, pp. 117-46.
- Campbell, Joseph, and Henry Morton Robinson. *A Skelton Key to Finnegans Wake*. Penguin, 1977.
- Cheng, Vincent J. "'Goddinpotty': James Joyce and the Language of Excrement." *The Language of Joyce: Selected Papers from the 11th International James Joyce Symposium*, edited by Rosa Maria Bosinelli Bollettieri et al., John Benjamins, 1992, pp. 85-99.
- Cohen, William A. "Introduction: Locating Filth." Cohen and Johnson, pp. vii-xxxvii.
- Cohen, William, and Ryan Johnson, editors. *Filth: Dirt, Disgust and Modern Life*. U of Minnesota P, 2005.
- Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. Routledge, 2003.
- Ellmann, Richard. *James Joyce*. Oxford UP, 1959.
- Figes, Orlando. *Crimea: The Last Crusade*. Penguin, 2011.

- Gifford, Don, and Robert J. Seidman. *Ulysses Annotated: Notes for James Joyce's Ulysses*. 2nd ed., U of California P, 1988.
- Glosses of Finnegans Wake*. *N.p.*, 15 July 2017, www.finwake.com/.
- Joyce, James. *Finnegans Wake*. 1939. Edited by Robbert-Jan Henkes et al., Oxford UP, 2012.
- Kinglake, Alexander William. *The Invasion of the Crimea: Its Origin and an Account of Its Progress Down to the Death of Lord Raglan*. 6th ed., vol. 9, Cambridge UP, 2010.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. Translated by Leon S. Roudiez, Columbia UP, 1982.
- McHugh, Roland. *Annotations to Finnegans Wake*. Routledge and Kagan, 1980.
- Mitchell, Andrew. "Excremental Self-Creation in *Finnegans Wake*." *Hypermedia Joyce Studies*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2004, hjs.ff.cuni.cz/archives/v3/Mitchell.html.
- Miyahara, Shun. "*Finnegans Wake* ni Okeru Haijo to Hougan: Abject wo Meguru Sei no Kanshoku" ["The Exclusion and Inclusion in *Finnegans Wake*: The Sense of Life in the Abject"]. *Nihon Eibungakkai* 89, Shizuoka Campus, Shizuoka U, 21 May 2017, Address.
- Miyata, Kyouko, editor and translator. *Shouyaku Finnegans Wake [The Abridged Translation of Finnegans Wake]*. By James Joyce, Shūeisha, 2004.
- Ortega y Gasset, José. *Taishu no Hangyaku [The Revolt of the Masses]*. Translated by Keizou Kanki, Chikuma Shobou, 1995.
- "Recusant." Entry 1. Def. 1a, *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged*, 1967.
- Sayers, William. "The Russian General, Gargantua, and Writing of Wit's Waste." *Joyce Studies Annual*, vol. 2008, 2008, pp. 146-62.
- Whitley, Catherine. "Nations and the Night: Excremental History in James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* and Djuna Barnes' *Nightwood*." *Journal of Modern Literature*, vol. 24, no. 1, 2000, pp. 81-98.

(Graduate Student)

SUMMARY

How Buckley Shot the Russian General:
Historical Surface and Personal Depth in the Layers of the Realities
in *Finnegans Wake*

Shun MIYAHARA

James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* (hereafter cited as the *Wake*) has often been condemned as being unintelligible, in part due to its multilingual wordplay which creates strata of signification. Scholars have dissected the novel to illuminate the main story line and proposed main motifs, such as Edenic sin, sexual offences, the fall of man, sibling rivalry, and the cyclic structure of human history.

Despite many scatological elements in the *Wake*, research in this sphere only began to appear in the 1990s. Critics have examined excremental motifs in the work, but they generally reiterate a main structure of the novel that was established by previous researchers, which results in a one-sided intelligible interpretation. Rather than determining the monolithic meaning of each scatological motif, the complicated relationships between different semiotic structures needs to be unravelled.

The Wakean excremental episode of "How Buckley Shot the Russian General" reveals the layered structure of reality. A word-by-word examination of Wakean language demonstrates that the episode's structure consists of an upper historical layer that conceals a lower personal layer. Analysing these layers provides possible explanations for why Buckley shoots the Russian general. The political/religious and cultural aspects of historical reality flow on the upper layer, which is comparably visible. The politico-religious reality, with its features of the Crimean War, and the cultural reality, Buckley's disobedience to a modern value system that rejects excrement, present reasons for Buckley's hesitation and shot. Under the upper historical reality, the lower personal reality, which is fragmented, twisted, and bracketed, reveals Buckley's homo- and heterosexual desires. However, because his ambivalent sexuality and inconsistent desires cannot be categorised, the lower personal reality indicates an abject stratum in reality's layered structure.